DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 030 TM 009 876

AUTHOR Thornton, Philip F.
TITLE Linker Training Workshops. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.: West Virginia State Dept. of Education, Charleston.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Research and Development Centers; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Training Techniques; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Linkage Agents; West Virginia

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the efforts made to provide linker training to educational personnel at the local and regional levels in West Virginia. The workshop evaluation follows a review of: (1) the rationale for the National Institute of Education's funding of regionally located Research and Development Exchanges; (2) the workshop planning procedure which included a survey of participant-felt needs, objectives, and activities; and (3) the actual implementation process. The evaluation instrument--a forced-choiced type which asked for the participants' perceptions of the practical applications, resources and activities, and purposes--and workshop handouts are included. The results indicate that attendees felt the workshop was successful, although it might have covered a longer period of time. (Author/GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181030

LINKER TRAINING WORKSHOP

FINAL REPORT
April 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philip Thornton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

TM009 876

West Virginia Department of Education
Appalachia Educational Laboratory

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION
EXECUTIVE OFFICES
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Bob E. Myers, President
Huntington, 1985

Mrs. Mary Martha Merritt, Vice-President
Beckley, 1983

Dr. Samuel J. Baskerville, Secretary
Charleston, 1980

James P. Clark, Member
St. Albans, 1986

James Paul Geary, Member
Petersburg, 1978

Ex Officio Member
Dr. Daniel B. Taylor
Superintendent
West Virginia Department of Education

Dr. Carl J. Roncaglione, Member
Charleston, 1981

William M. Smith, Member
Follansbee, 1982

Dr. Charles H. Wagoner, Member
Weston, 1984

Fountie N. Williams, Member
Clarksburg, 1979

Ex Officio Member
Dr. Ben L. Morton
Chancellor
West Virginia Board of Regents

LINKER TRAINING WORKSHOP

FINAL REPORT
April 1978

Prepared by

PHILIP F. THORNTON

J. DOUGLAS MACHESNEY
ASSISTANT STATE SUPERINTENDENT
BUREAU OF PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

DANIEL B. TAYLOR
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

West Virginia Department of Education/Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Charleston, West Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Although the workshop was held for a small group of participants, the preparation was thorough and complete. Richard Doneghy from the West Virginia Department of Education, Sandra Orletsky and Dr. George H. Love from the Appalachia Educational Laboratory, and Dr. William Ward from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory were responsible for the pre-workshop planning and preparation which resulted in a two day program designed to make linkers of the participants by providing experiences to internalize the concept.

For a successful workshop, the introductory remarks must be relevant to the approaching task. Dr. J. Douglas Machesney, Assistant State Superintendent, West Virginia Department of Education, started the workshop by presenting the Department's view on linkage among the involved groups: the Department, the Appalachia Educational Laboratory, the county educational personnel, and the regional educational personnel. A concept for working together to provide access to resources according to the users needs was presented. Dr George H. Love reviewed the background of the Research and Development Exchange (RDx) idea, the development, and the present status. His discussion included information about the services provided by the five regional exchanges throughout the country, and the four central services which are offered by three educational laboratories and one research and development center. The services provided by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory as one of the regional exchanges were presented in detail. Richard Doneghy discussed the role of the participants in future dissemination activities.

Also, he presented an outline of the activities planned and the responsibilities of the participants during the workshop.

Dr. William Ward from the Linkage Training Service, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, acted as co-leader of the workshop with Dr. George Love. Dr. Ward's experience in working with similar groups across the country was used in the exercises and discussions on theory and practice throughout the workshop. Sandra Orletsky and Richard Doneghy assisted the leaders.

As the evaluator, I am indebted to the leaders and their assistants for their cooperation and assistance in attaining the data and information which made this report possible.

Philip F. Thornton
West Virginia Department of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		iii
Section		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OBJECTIVE DEVELOPMENT AND WORKSHOP PLANNING	4
III.	WORKSHOP PROCESSES	6
IV.	EVALUATION: LINKER TRAINING WORKSHOP	9
	Participants	9
	Analysis and Interpretation Procedures	10
	Participants' Perception of Purposes of Linker Training	11
	Participants' Perception of Resources and Activities Associated with the Workshop	12
	Participants' Perception of Practical Application of Linker Training	12
	Participants' Total Perceptions of the Linker Training Workshop	13
	Best Liked Features of the Workshop	14
	Least Liked Features of the Workshop	14
	Activities in Future Workshops	14
	Value of Workshop Activities	15
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	17
APPENDIXES		21
•	ADDENDUM TO SUBCONTRACT	23
•	CHECKLIST TO INVENTORY SKILLS Participant Survey Instrument	25
•	WORKSHOP AGENDA	30

- WORKSHOP HANDOUTS 31
- WORKSHOP EVALUATION INSTRUMENT 33
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS 37
- WORKSHOP STAFF 39

I. INTRODUCTION

With the monies made available for research and development since the 1960's, an array of materials and practices have become available which may assist the educational practitioners. However, the abundance has not been widely disseminated or always available. For this reason, the National Institute of Education funded planning and testing activities in 1977 which were designed to operationalize the Research and Development Exchange (RDx).

Currently, the Research and Development Exhange is operated by a consortium of regional educational laboratories and a university-based research and development center. The goal of the RDx is to create an exhange of information among researchers and developers and the educational practitioners. This involves the exchange of two types of information. First, practitioners are provided with access to information that allows them to match their needs to R & D results -- the dissemination process. Second, practitioners are provided with an opportunity to communicate their needs to the R & D community -- the feedforward process.

To reach the educational practitioners, the five regional exchanges enlisted the help of the state departments of education within the states served. Within each state department one or more contact persons were appointed to act as intermediaries between an RDx and school systems and schools within that state. Thus, these contacts perform a <u>linkage</u> role between an RDx and a practitioner.

Due to their function, these people are known as linkers.

In brief, the RDx system works as follows:

1. A practitioner calls upon the state linker for needed resources.
2. The state linker refers the request, if necessary, to the RDx.
3. The RDx replies with information from its depository of information and products, or obtains the needed material from another RDx.

To fully utilize the RDx depository, a state needs more than the state department linker(s). The logical procedure was to establish a cadre of linkers throughout a state who could link local practitioners to a state linker. Since most states have intermediate school units each of which serves a number of local educational agencies, training was needed for one or more linkers at the intermediate levels.

To meet the need for linkers at intermediate levels within West Virginia, the Appalachia Educational Laboratory - RDx subcontracted with the West Virginia Department of Education for the purpose of providing linker training. Two training workshops have been held. Canaan Valley State Park, Davis, West Virginia was the site of the first workshop on October 12-14, 1977. This workshop was a part of a larger conference for Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title IV personnel. The special conference emphasis for the 160 participants dealt with linkers and their role in dissemination of

R & D materials and products and the new concept of feedforward by practitioners. The linker training workshop was provided to sixteen of the participants on October 12 and 13. The second linker training workshop was held on April 6-7, 1978, at the Appalachia Educational Laboratory facility in Charleston, West Virginia. Seven educators from intermediate educational units or local education agencies participated. Professional responsibilities of the participants were research (2), supervisor (2), coordinator of teacher education programs (1), coordinator of special education programs (1), and administrative assistant to a county superintendent (1).

The ensuing is a report on the workshop objectives, the processes, and the resultant outcome as perceived by the participants. This Section is followed by Section II which discusses the development of the workshop objectives and the subsequent planning. Section III reviews the processes used in the workshop. Section IV presents the analysis and interpretation procedures and the resultant workshop outcomes as perceived by the participants. The final section, Section V, summarizes the participants perceptions and presents conclusions.

II. OBJECTIVE DEVELOPMENT AND WORKSHOP PLANNING

Educators have been exposed to a wide variety of learning experiences through both formal and informal training. For this reason, the workshop planners surveyed the future participants prior to planning to ascertain their felt needs in the following skills:

Communication

Public Relation and Marketing

Planning

Evaluation

Problem Solving

Needs Determination

Implementation

Management and Organization

Process Development

Each skill was thought to be necessary for a person to be a successful linker. (See Appendixes for a copy of the survey instrument).

The felt needs associated with the skills were translated into workshop objectives. The objectives were stated as follows:

To enable participants to assess their own roles and linkage skills and training needs.

To provide participants an opportunity to review linker training materials and concepts.

To provide participants with an opportunity to increase their skills.

- To provide an opportunity for persons from different RESA's to share experiences that will contribute to building a support system.
- To enable the RESA's to understand the dissemination and linkage role of the SEA.
- To provide an understanding of the Regional Exchange, R & D Exchange and the services that can be provided.

Based on the objectives, the planners developed a tentative list of topics to be included in the workshop. A search ensued to discover the available techniques and activities that might be used in presenting the topics to the participants. Professional positions and responsibilities, plus any information about the participants preferences, were considered in selection of the final techniques and activities which would be most appropriate for the participants. Also, total time available was a serious consideration.

Once techniques and activities were decided, the task turned to establishing the final time frame -- the agenda. The planners, the leaders and co-leaders, sequenced the activities to lead to an individual's self-analysis, to an analysis of an individual's present role as a linker, and to an informed perspective or an individuals future role as a linker. The overall strategy was one of obtaining early and continuous participant involvement. Theory and practical techniques of the linkage concept were to be introduced as warranted by the participants analysis.

III. WORKSHOP PROCESSES

It is helpful in understanding the outcome of a workshop to know the processes used. Therefore, a brief description of the Linker Training Workshop processes is presented.

The workshop was held in the conference room of the Appalachia Educational Laboratory facility in Charleston. As the participants arrived at noon, they received a packet of materials (see Appendixes) and a chicken box luncheon. Each was instructed to respond to Handout #1 and place the response on their back where others could read it. The word "I" was used in five statements. After lunch these statements served to introduce participants and leaders to one another during a period of informal conversation.

The period for making acquaintances was followed by introductory remarks. Dr. J. Douglas Machesney, Assistant State Superintendent, West Virginia Department of Education, presented the Department's perspective of linkage among the involved groups. A systematic means of working together to bring research and development to the practitioners was presented. Dr. George H. Love, Director of the Appalachia Educational Laboratory Regional Exchange (AEL-Rx), provided information about services provided by the five regional exchanges throughout the country. He discussed the support system which is provided by four central services. These four central services provide dissemination training, interpret and synthesize information about R & D outcomes, maintain a data bank of information resources, and facilitate the operation of the total Research and Development Exchange (RDx). Specific reference was

made to the resource and referral services available through the AEL-Rx. Richard Doneghy from the West Virginia Department of Education moved the participants thinking from a general to a personal concern for the linker concept. Mr. Doneghy discussed the participant's role in future dissemination activities and how the workshop would help them better perform.

Handout #2 was distributed to the participants (see Appendixes). The participants spent 30 minutes writing about their present duties and functions as a regional education service agency (RESA) or local education agency (LEA) employee. Their comments served as the basis for group discussion of how each was serving as a linker at present. In mid-afternoon, a short break was taken which was followed by additional discussion of present linkage activities.

The group interaction session dealing with self-analysis and analyses of present roles as linkers was followed by a discussion of the linker operational concept. Dr. William Ward, Northwest Laboratory Linker Training Services, led the discussion by referring to a diagram on the chalkboard. The diagram showed the practitioner's activities along with the linker's possible input for each activity. It was explained that such input could be made from the resources available through the regional exchanges. The discussion served to clarify the materials and products the linker may supply the practitioner.

The first day's activities ended with each participant describing their perceptions of those activities (see Handout #3, Appendixes). After completion, the participants departed and the workshop leaders

met to study the comments along with their own observations. This critique was used to make minor revisions in the second day's planned activities.

The second day's activities were started by Richard Doneghy. Mr. Doneghy discussed linkage and dissemination and the State Department's role. A discussion followed in which the meaning of the two words was reviewed. Dr. Ward, with assistance from the other leaders, provided specific statements about the nature of both words. This provided the framework for individual internalization and resultant definitions for the two words.

The two assistant leaders presented a role playing situation in which a practitioner was requesting resources through the State Department linker. This conversation was followed by a group discussion of the length of time a linker should spend with an individual practitioner.

A second role playing situation involved one of the workshop participants. Again the total discussion was analyzed for role appropriateness of both the practitioner and the linker.

Handout #4 (see Appendixes) was provided as a method to encourage a re-evaluation of present roles after workshop exposure. Participant completion of this handout produced a large amount of personal introspection which resulted in discussion with the leaders of methods of improving their linker role.

Completion of a written evaluation of the workshop activities was the final activity (see Appendixes).

IV. EVALUATION: LINKER TRAINING WORKSHOP

In the last session on the final day of the workshop, an evaluation form (see Appendixes) was distributed to participants. Each of the seven participants in attendance at the final session returned a completed form. All participants were in attendance both days.

The purpose of this evaluation was twofold--to provide feedback on the participant's perceived success and to provide information which will assist in planning related workshops in the future. Feedback on perceptions was attained through participant response to statements on a Likert-type scale. Three subscores and a total score of participant perception were attainable from the Likert-type scale section of the evaluation form. Although response to individual statements and groups of statements in the Likert-scaled section may provide general direction for planning future workshops, the free response of participants should provide specific direction. The results are presented in the same order as the sections, statements, and items appearing on the evaluation form.

Participants

Four of the seven participants were affiliated with Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs) with the remainder affiliated with county central offices. From RESAs, two were researchers and two were coordinators. The primary responsibility of the coordinators differed with one having duties in special education and the other in teacher education. The responsibilities of the county central office staff included two with supervisory and one with administrative duties. One supervised a federal program while a second supervised elementary

education. The third from the central office was an administrative assistant to a superintendent.

Analysis and Interpretation Procedures

Section II of the evaluation form contains 28 statements. Each statement is designed to elicit a participant's perception on a Likert-type scale (a five-point scale).

Section II, for analysis purposes, may be divided into three subsections: purposes (objectives) of the workshop (8 statements), resources and activities of the workshop (12 statements), practical application of workshop activities (8 statements). Each of the 28 statements has a maximum score of five (5) and a minimum score of one (1) with strongly equated as five (5) and strongly disagree equated as one (1).

For any one participant, a score was computed for the total section and each subsection. In all cases, the score is the sum of scores for the individual statements. The maximum score for Section II is 140 and the maximum scores for subsections are objectives and needs (ON)--40, resources and activities (RA)--60, and practical applications (PA)--40.

For group analysis, the mean (average) score for the group was calculated both for the total of Section II and each of the three subsections. From these values, a percentage of success was calculated which was based on an equating of the maximum score to 100 percent. Also, from the group mean scores, a verbal statement of success was determined. Table I shows range of scores which was equated with a given verbal statement of success.

TABLE I

Table for Determining Verbal Descriptor of Linker Trainees' Perception of Workshop Success*

VERBAL DESCRIPTOR	MEAN SCORE			
	Section II	Purpose	Resources & Activities	Practical Applications
Very Successful	112-140	32-40	48-60	32-40
Successful	84-111	24-31	36-47	24-31
Unsuccessful	56-83	16-23	24-35	16-23
Very Successful	28-55	8-15	12-23	8-15

*For Section II of Evaluation Form

Additional analysis of success of the workshop (Section II) was accomplished through the computation of range of scores, the mode, and the median.

An analysis of the item responses to Section III (Free Response) was through a tallying of similar statements (items 1, 2, and 3). For the fourth item--ranking by value the four workshop activities-- a tally by rank for each of the four activities was made. The total tally of responses in the two highest rank positions on the four activities determined the overall group ranking of the four activities. (See Table III for totals of individual rankings of value of workshop activities.)

Participants' Perception of Purposes of Linker Training[1]

A subsection of Section II of the evaluation form dealt with purposes (objectives and needs) of the workshop. The maximum score on this

[1]See Table II for an overall view of perceived success of the workshop.

subsection was 40. The range of scores was 29 to 37 with a mode of 31, a median of 31, and mean of 21.9. The mean (average) score converts to a percent of perceived success of 80. Using the verbal descriptor scale, participants perceived the workshop to be between successful and very successful. (See Table I). (That is, the mean was between the scores considered to indicate successful and very successful).

Participants' Perception of Resources and Activities Associated with the Workshop[2]

This subsection of Section II dealt with materials and processes. The maximum score on the subsection was 60. The range of scores was 33 to 54 with a mode of 52, a median of 50, and a mean of 48. The mean (average) score converts to a percent of perceived success of 80. Using the verbal scale to describe success, this subsection of the workshop was perceived by the participants as borderline between successful and very successful. (See Table I).

Participants' Perception of Practical Application of Linker Information[3]

This subsection of Section II dealt with the participants' perception of utilization of the Linker system. The maximum score on this subsection was 40. The range of scores was 30 to 35 with a mode of 35, a median of 34, and a mean of 33.6. The mean (average) score converts to a percent of perceived success of 84. Using the verbal scale to describe success, this subsection was perceived as very successful. (See Table I).

---

[2]See Table II for an overall view of perceived success of the workshop.

[3]Same reference as 2.

Participants' Total Perception of the Linker Training Workshop[4]

The three scores on the subsections of Section II of the Workshop Evaluation form were combined to determine the overall perception. On the total section, the maximum score was 140. The range of scores was 95 to 122 with a mode of 112, a median of 114, and a mean of 113.4. The mean (average) score converts to a percent of perceived success of 81. The overall perception was that the workshop was very successful.

TABLE II

Summary of Participant* Perception of Linker Training Workshop (Derived From Evaluation Form Data, Section II)

SECTION II	SCORES					SUCCESS	
	Total	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Percent	Verbal Descriptor
Grand Total (GT)	794	113.4	114	112	95-122	81	Very Successful
Purposes (Objectives -ON)	223	31.9	31	31	29-37	80	Successful
Resources and Activities (RA)	336	48	50	52	33-54	80	Very Successful
Practical Applications (PA)	235	33.6	34	35	30-35	84	Very Successful

*Seven Participants

[4]See Table II for an overall view of perceived success of the workshop.

Best Liked Features of the Workshop

This was an open-ended statement that was answered by all participants. Some of the participants made more than one comment. Five indicated interaction among participants as the best liked feature. This was followed by three noting four features as best: brainstorming of problems, consultants, atmosphere (friendly and informal), and the idea exchange. Two thought the resources and the simulations (role playing) were the best features. Small group work was mentioned by one as the best feature of the workshop.

Least Liked Features of the Workshop

Participant comments concerning the least liked features of the workshop were made in response to an open-ended statement (see instrument in Appendixes). Although the seven participants responded, in no case did more than two make a similar remark. In three cases, two participants agreed on a least liked feature. The three cases in which two agreed were: 1) the completion of less than planned (time was too short for the planned activities.), 2) an excess of time on individual problems (i.e., strategies for solutions), and 3) the length of sessions and lack of breaks (inherent in short workshop with large task). Initial explanation of the linker concept and purpose of the workshop were each noted by one participant as the least liked feature of the workshop.

Activities in a Future Workshop

Perceptions of participants are valuable for the planning of future workshops. For this reason, participants were asked to list those

activities they would like to see in future workshops. In response, to this request, there was greatest agreement (3 participants) that group process, administration and organization skills, presentation and marketing skills for linker training should be paramount. Two participants thought the present statewide linker system should be emphasized with the linker's specific role noted. Of a related nature, two participants believed a variety of linker simulations would be helpful in understanding the linker's role. A chance to review and study materials prior to the workshop was mentioned by one participant.

Value of Workshop Activities

The participants ranked the four major activities on the basis of personal value in the attainment of a concept of the linker process. A four was used to represent that activity which was most valuable, and a one was used to represent the activity considered of least value.

To obtain a rough measure of the perceived value of the four activities, the number of check marks corresponding to a rating of a 3 or 4 indicated the magnitude of the group's perception of the activities of most value. Likewise, ratings of 1 or 2 indicated the magnitude of the group's perception of the activities of least value. This process resulted in a group ranking of the four activities from most to least valuable as follows: Role-Playing Exercises, Discussion Session (general), Case Studies, and Reading Assignments. The number of participants who placed a given value on a specific activity is shown in Table III.

TABLE III

Frequency of Rankings of Value
of Workshop Activities

ACTIVITY	Ranking* 1	2	3	4	ACTIVITY	Ranking* 1	2	3	4
Discussion Sessions (General)	1	0	1	3	Reading Assignments	3	2	0	0
Case Studies	1	2	2	0	Role-Playing Exercises	0	1	2	2

*Four (4) is highest rank One (1) is lowest rank

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

All workshop participants completed the evaluation form, and only two failed to complete a single item -- number 4, Part III. This item is open-ended and requires ranking of the activities.

The professional affiliation of the workshop participants was with RESAs and county central offices. The primary responsibilities of participants included research, program coordination, program supervision, and administration.

Systematic planning for the workshop included a survey of the future participants' felt needs, a translation of needs into objectives, and a series of planning conferences. The planning conferences involved the Director and Dissemination Specialist from the AEL-Rx, the State Department linker, and a national linkage training expert. After the first day's activities a review was held and plans were modified as needed.

Except for initial introductory remarks, handouts, and brief directions at the change of sessions, the workshop drew from the participants. Such a procedure was successful in producing discussion of their present role and how that role may be modified to improve their linkage function. The leaders provided necessary information about the linker's role and the nationwide and statewide linkage network.

The evaluation indicated that the participants perceived the workshop to be very successful when the entire instrument was used as the unit of analysis and either successful or very successful when the subparts were used as the unit of analysis. The participants gave an overall rating of 81 percent success to the workshop. An analysis of the

subparts of the evaluation data indicated greatest workshop success with practical application (84%) which was followed by resources and activities and purposes, both at 80%.

From the free response section of the evaluation, the participants indicated greatest satisfaction with those activities in which they were actively involved. They were not as keen about passive participation. Interaction with others, brainstorming of problems, and group process were specifically noted as best liked features.

The comments concerning the least liked features of the workshop had one common theme - time. This was expressed as not enough time for planned activities, too much time on some activities, shorten the time on some activities, lengthen time of workshop. Less important to participants was complaints concerning lack of prior receipt of materials, knowledge of goals, and early explanation of linkage concept.

Participant ranking of value of activities should provide some guidelines in the future for both time and emphasis. The results are particularly significant since an earlier workshop -- October 13-14, 1977 -- produced the same rank order. Again, role-playing was most acceptable while reading assignments were least acceptable.

From the reported perceptions, one must conclude the workshop was successful. However, most participants were concerned with time. Perhaps a similar workshop should encompass a longer time period. Other worthy considerations as suggested by participants are: 1) send materials prior to workshop; 2) place more emphasis on purpose early in the workshop; 3) give a strong explanation of linkage early in the workshop, and 4) present the statewide linkage system in more detail.

A careful review of this report should indicate to the reader that the workshop was very favorably received by the participants. Therefore in future planning recognition of the specific strengths and weaknesses should assure an even better workshop.

APPENDIXES

- Addendum to Subcontract
- Checklist to Inventory Skills
  (Participant Survey Instrument)
- Workshop Agenda
- Workshop Handouts
- Workshop Evaluation Instrument
- Workshop Participants
- Workshop Staff

ARTICLE I: Addendum to Scope of Work
for Subcontract # 006 Between AEL-Rx and the
West Virginia State Department of Education

The Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation of the West Virginia Department of Education is planning to conduct a second one and one-half day linker training workshop in Charleston. The purpose of this workshop will be to extend West Virginia's current linker force by selecting RESA representatives in order to insure coverage in all regions of the state.

A total of eight participants will be selected for this workshop. The objectives will be the same as those for the first linker training session; they are shown on the attachment. This workshop will aid in establishing a cadre of trained linkers througout the state and will be another step in the development of a coordinated dissemination network in West Virginia.

Estimated cost for participants travel, lodging and other workshop expenses is $870.00. Eight textbooks (Linker Processes in Educational Improvement), must be ordered at the cost of $7.50 each. The total cost of the one and one-half day workshop will be:

1.	Travel to and from Charleston for one person from each of the eight RESAs	$350.00
2.	Meals (Eight participants at $9.00/day	72.00
3.	Lodging (Eight participants at $28.00/day for two days)	448.00
4.	Books (8) Linker Processes in Education Improvement	60.00
5.	Postage and handling	2.38
	TOTAL	$932.38

The West Virginia State Department of Education will be establishing a small resource and materials center in each RESA focusing on linkage, change and innovation and other designated topics, such as competency based education. The following is a listing of publications to be purchased for the RESA resource centers. Three copies of each will be ordered.

CHECKLIST TO INVENTORY SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE OF
CONSULTANTS IN HUMAN RESOURCES INVENTORY*

People who can give assistance in communications

_____A. Synthesizing and summarizing complex material

_____B. Building communication systems between groups and agencies. Systems characterized by 2-way communication channels

_____C. Diagnosing communication breakdowns in school buildings, LEAs, SEAs and between agencies and their clients

_____D. Providing training in the acquisition of communication skills to facilitate group interaction and problem solving

_____E. Identifying and diagnosing conflict situations and providing techniques for coping with conflicts

_____F. Preparing written materials for selected target audiences (e.g., parents, teachers, administrators, legislators)

_____G. Collecting information, organizing information and preparing feedback of information based on information needs

_____H. Updating and modifying materials based on experience (e.g., subject matter materials, training materials)

People who can give assistance in public relations and marketing

_____A. Designing and implementing region-wide and nation-wide publicity strategies

_____B. Publicizing activities and results in client districts, states, region

_____C. Preparing packages of materials

_____D. Presenting and utilizing audio-visual materials

_____E. Presenting and utilizing audio-visual materials

---

*This instrument was adapted from Fred Rosenau, Far West Laboratory, and the National Diffusion Network Skills Taxonomy.

Participants indicated their felt needs on this survey instrument prior to the workshop.

_____F. Designing and conducting training events in public relations and marketing. Training dissemination/ liaison personnel in SEAs, LEAs

_____G. Comparing/contrasting costs of alternative dissemination strategies

People who can give assistance in planning

_____A. Determining goals, objectives and work plans

_____B. Prioritizing client needs

_____C. Prioritizing activities

_____D. Determining action strategies based on a thorough diagnosis of client's situation, goals and assumptions

_____E. Determining action steps and providing charting activities and time lines for implementing and operationalizing a project

_____F. Conducting needed assessment and diagnosis in adapting a project to meet local needs

_____G. Assessing and diagnosing training needs in order to select appropriate training strategies

_____H. Designing and organizing training events including workshops, seminars, conferences

_____I. Identifying major tasks, developing a project approach to dissemination

_____J. Designing and conducting training events in planning (e.g., system analysis, action research)

People who can give assistance in evaluation

_____A. Preparing project evaluation designs

_____B. Preparing and communicating statistical data

_____C. Implementing evaluation designs

_____D. Using evaluation data to modify programs, strategies, materials and subsequent evaluation

_____E. Assisting LEAs, SEAs, Rxs in monitoring program/ project effectiveness

_____F. Measuring the effectiveness of a workshop (e.g., training design, presentations, experimental activities, support materials)

_____G. Determining the relative merits of different programs

_____H. Identifying criteria for determining exemplary adoptions

_____I. Locating and arranging for evaluation assistance as necessary

_____J. Documenting different processes including description of problems and processes (e.g., installation, planning, implementation)

People who can give assistance in problem solving

_____A. Developing and conducting formal needs assessment (questionnaire development, data analysis, diagnosis, drawing conclusions)

_____B. Performing informal needs analysis (reviewing available data, situational analysis, diagnosing goals and assumptions, deriving conclusions)

_____C. Brainstorming problems with clients

_____D. Clarifying and achieving consensus on client problems

_____E. Assessing client motivations and capacity for change

_____F. Diagnosing client system's needs, problems, group process issues (norms, constraints, roles, etc.)

_____G. Retrieving scientific information/knowledge for problem analysis and diagnosis

_____I. Brainstorming action alternatives

_____J. Designing and conducting training events for the acquisition of problem solving skills

People who can give assistance in resource acquisition, information collecting, analyzing information needs and skills

_____A. Formulating clear, concise needs/problems statements and retrieval requests; helping LEAs request information in searchable form

_____B. Retrieving documents and materials from source

_____C. Knowing user's preferred formats for print information (avoiding technicality, "ERIC," "journalese," etc.)

_____D. Identifying and contacting experts/specialists for additional information, guidelines and help

_____E. Identifying related commercial and noncommercial educational materials

_____F. Recognizing differences between knowledge-based and non-knowledge-based options

_____G. Analyzing existing resource materials

_____H. Examining documents for omissions

_____I. Deriving implications for practice from research-based information

People who can give assistance in <u>implementation</u>

_____A. Helping build implementation plans

_____B. Conducting analysis and force field diagnosis of implementation plans

_____C. Helping plan appropriate orientation and/or training for staff, citizens, and students who will be affected by the change

_____D. Helping clients locate federal/state/foundation/other supplementary sources to install/implement programs

_____E. Helping clients organize effective in-service training

_____F. Designing and conducting training to build the necessary prerequisite skills to facilitate implementation of program

People who can give assistance in <u>management and organizational skills</u>

_____A. Knowing the literature of planned change

_____B. Designing and conducting organizational development projects

_____C. Applying techniques for cash flow (collection and payment procedures)

_____D. Applying budgeting methods (zero-based, cost-accounting, PPBS)

_____E. Knowing about copyright laws affecting projects; state and federal audit procedures and accounting; federal and state statutes and guidelines related to programs

_____F. Knowing about writing and analyzing contracts; filing and record keeping systems

_____G. Developing procedures for personnel selection and training

_____H. Identifying and training turn-key trainers

_____I. Identifying and contracting with training specialists to design, develop training programs

_____J. Developing client proposal-writing skills

_____K. Eliciting and using parental and community input

_____L. Creating training events for developing interpersonal skills

People who can give assistance in process helping

_____A. Facilitating and conducting effective meetings

_____B. Developing methods and techniques for increasing group's ability to conduct values clarification activities

_____C. Developing observational sensitivity to provide appropriate feedback on group performance

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LINKER TRAINING WORKSHOP

April 6-7, 1978

Charleston, West Virginia

April 6, 1978--Thursday

12:00 Noon	Lunch
1:00 p.m.	Stage Setting Dr. J. Douglas Machesney - SEA Expectations Dr. George H. Love - Rx, RDx, and AEL Relationships Mr. Rick Doneghy - Introduction of Workshop
2:00 p.m.	Role Mapping, Assessment of Current Activities Dr. George H. Love, Dr. William Ward, Ms. Sandra Orletsky and Mr. Rick Doneghy
5:30 p.m.	Dinner Break - Homework Assignments - Assessment - Debriefing

April 7, 1978--Friday

8:30 a.m.	Continuation of Above if Necessary Review/Discuss Literature Communications, Problem Solving, Planning, Process Skills
10:30 a.m.	Break
1:00 p.m.	Evaluation, Adjournment, Debriefing

HANDOUT #1

Hello! My name is _____. Five things beginning with the word, I, that I don't mind sharing with you are:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

HANDOUT #2

You have thirty minutes to write about your duties or functions as a RESA employee. Include responses to the following questions:

1. With whom do you interact?

2. How would you describe your relationship with them?

3. What are some of the positive interactions?

4. What are some of the negative interactions?

5. What difficulties have you encountered?

6. What did you do to overcome or reduce the difficulties?

Name: _____

HANDOUT #3

Describe your perceptions of today's workshop. Include statements about your feelings and whether the workshop is meeting your objectives. What suggestions can you offer for improvement?

HANDOUT #4

Review Handout #2. List below the goals and objectives that you have for your job performance. What strategies have you considered that will help to improve your job performance? What assumptions are you making regarding your performance goals and your strategies?

Name: _____

LINKER TRAINING WORKSHOP
APPALACHIA EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA
April 6 and 7, 1978

By taking a few minutes to give your reactions to this workshop, you will assist us in our efforts to improve those in the future. Your response will assist us in providing resources, activities, and content which will be most effective in meeting the participants' needs.

I. Demographic Data

1. My primary professional affiliation is with *(check only one)*

_____Regional Education Service Agency

_____County Central Office

_____Other, _____
Identify

2. My primary professional responsibility is *(check only one)*

_____ESEA Director

_____Assistant Superintendent

_____Superintendent

_____Other, _____
Identify

- - - - - - - - - - -

---EVALUATION INSTRUMENT CONTINUED NEXT PAGE---

- - - - - - - - - - -

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY--DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE
. . . . . .

ON = _____

RA = _____

PA = _____

_____

GT = _____

II. Consultant Conducted Activities

Directions: Respond to each statement. Use the scale

SD = strongly disagree, D = disagree, U = undecided, A = agree,

SA = strongly agree. *Please circle the response which best represents your feeling.*

1.	I was made aware of the purposes of the workshop before I came to the workshop.	1. SD D U A SA
2.	The workshop purposes were clearly stated in the initial presentation.	2. SD D U A SA
3.	The workshop purposes were related to my professional concerns as an educator.	3. SD D U A SA
4.	Most of this workshop centered around material that was interesting, challenging, and usable.	4. SD D U A SA
5.	The purpose of this workshop made sense to me.	5. SD D U A SA
6.	The workshop purposes were met to a high degree.	6. SD D U A SA
7.	This workshop should be held again with the same content for those of my colleagues who were unable to attend.	7. SD D U A SA
8.	A related workshop should be held again for the same participants on a more advanced level.	8. SD D U A SA
9.	This workshop had some components which were unique or innovative.	9. SD D U A SA
10.	The scheduled workshop activities made good use of the time available.	10. SD D U A SA
11.	The presentations were well organized.	11. SD D U A SA
12.	The workshop personnel (speakers, presenters, and resource persons) provided the kind of information, expertise, creativity, and communication skills expected by me as a participant.	12. SD D U A SA

13.	The sessions offered stimulating material.	13.	SD	D	U	A	SA
14.	My questions were dealt with satisfactorily.	14.	SD	D	U	A	SA
15.	The workshop provided an opportunity to review a variety of linker training materials.	15.	SD	D	U	A	SA
16.	Instructional resources were appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop purposes.	16.	SD	D	U	A	SA
17.	There was evidence of good administrative practice in leadership and supervision on the part of the workshop consultants.	17.	SD	D	U	A	SA
18.	Meeting room facilities were suitable.	18.	SD	D	U	A	SA
19.	The physical environment was adequate as far as lodging, lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, and other such things were concerned.	19.	SD	D	U	A	SA
20.	This workshop was a successful training experience for me.	20.	SD	D	U	A	SA
21.	The workshop content was practical and useful in helping improve my professional competence.	21.	SD	D	U	A	SA
22.	Reasonable progress was made by me individually towards meeting the purposes of the workshop.	22.	SD	D	U	A	SA
23.	I had a chance to provide feedback to the workshop staff.	23.	SD	D	U	A	SA
24.	I feel I have an adequate understanding of the concept of linkage.	24.	SD	D	U	A	SA
25.	This workshop has some implications for the way I carry out my professional responsibilities.	25.	SD	D	U	A	SA
26.	I am aware of the benefits linkage may provide to the schools.	26.	SD	D	U	A	SA
27.	Overall, this workshop was a worthwhile and valuable experience.	27.	SD	D	U	A	SA
28.	I am able to list specific benefits I received at this workshop.	28.	SD	D	U	A	SA

III. Free Response

1. Things I liked best about the workshop were

2. Things I liked least about the workshop were

3. Linker process and/or skill activities I would like to see in a future related workshop are

4. You have been involved in a number of activities. Based on their value to you in attaining a concept of the linker process rank order the four activities below. Use a four for the activity of highest value and a one for the activity of lowest value.

_____ Discussion Sessions (general)

_____ Case Studies

_____ Reading Assignments

_____ Role-playing Exercises

WEST VIRGINIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LINKER TRAINING PARTICIPANTS
APRIL 6-7, 1978
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

Mary Lou Fluharty Monongalia County Schools Annex 1 48 Edgewood Street Morgantown, WV 26505	Elementary Supervisor (304) 599-5603
Connie Golden RESA V 1210 13th Street Parkersburg, WV 26101	Teacher Education Coordinator (304) 435-6513
Nancy Kilmon RESA VIII 615 West King Street Martinsburg, WV 25401	Director, Research, Evaluation and Dissemination (304) 263-8948
Joe Paull RESA VII 300 McLane Avenue Morgantown, WV 26505	Coordinator of Research (304) 292-4684
Eddiena Schoolfield Raleigh County Schools 105 Adair Street Beckley, WV 25801	Supervisor, ESEA Title I (304) 252-7355
Ashey W. Shaver RESA IV 304 1st Avenue Lewisburg, WV 24901	Specialist, Special Education (304) 645-1260
James Simmons Kanawha County Schools 200 Elizabeth Street Charleston, WV 25311	Administrative Assistant (304) 348-7725

WORKSHOP STAFF

George Love
Associate Director
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325
(304) 344-8371

William Ward
Northwest Educational Laboratory
Lindsay Building
701 S. W. 2nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

ASSISTANT LEADERS

Richard Doneghy, Coordinator
Data Collection and Analysis
West Virginia Department of Education
Capitol Complex
Charleston, WV 25305
(304) 348-2686

Sandra Orletsky
Dissemination Specialist
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325
(304) 344-8371

OTHER SPEAKERS

J. Douglas Machesney
Assistant State Superintendent
West Virginia Department of Education
Capitol Complex
Charleston, WV 25305
(304) 348-3788